

App. No. 10/757,942  
Attorney Docket 3016.2.7 NP

**Amendments to the Drawings**

None

App. No. 10/757,942  
Attorney Docket 3016.2.7 NP

## Remarks

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Written Office Action. In particular, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing Claims 1 and 3 and for noting objection to claims 6 and 7.

Further, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for the phone conference of 5 January 2006, wherein claim language was discussed and no agreement was reached.

Still further, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for the phone conference of 12 January 2006, wherein potential claim language was discussed and agreement was reached that usage of the term "fluid mixing block system" in the preamble to Claim 1 instead of "fluid mixing block" is disclosed in the specification and would be allowable. Further it was agreed that dependent claims 9-16 could be amended to properly depend from the Amended Claim 8 and could be represented in new claims depending from Claim 1 as long as formalities are observed. No specific language was discussed for accomplishing such.


In response to the Written Office Action, Claim 4 is amended to include the limitations of Claim 6, as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 6 is canceled. Claim 7 is amended to depend from Claim 4. Further, Claim 8 is amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 1 and to use the language "fluid mixing block system" in the preamble, instead of merely "fluid mixing block" according to the agreement reached during the 12 January 2006 phone conference. Claims 10-12 and 16 are canceled. Claims 9, and 13-15 are amended to conform to the amended language of Claim 8. Claims 17-20 are new and depend from allowed Claim 1.

App. No. 10/757,942  
Attorney Docket 3016.2.7 NP

Conclusion

The Claims are amended as suggested by the Examiner. Furthermore, it is believed that the foregoing amendment has adequate support in the specification, and accordingly there should be no new matter. For these reasons, it is believed that none of the prior art teaches the claimed invention. Applicant believes the pending claims have addressed each of the issues pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action. In light of the foregoing amendment, the claims should be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the proposed changes, Applicant again invites the Examiner to do so by telephone conference.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Michael W. Starkweather  
Registration No. 34,441  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 1/17/06  
Starkweather and Associates  
9035 South 1300 East  
Suite 200  
Sandy, Utah 84094  
Telephone: 801/272-8368